

REMARKS:

In the Office Action the Examiner noted that claims 1-21 are pending in the application, and the Examiner rejected all claims. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 21 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Support for the claim amendments can be found on page 10, line 20 through page 11, line 6 of the Specification and Figure 10.

Thus, claims 1-21 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b):

Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by EAST Text Searching, published January 2000 (East).

On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicates that presenting an option of selecting the object of the search is not recited in the claims. Applicants respectfully point out that the language of amended claim 1, for example, states, "presenting said user with both of said search word and said extracted synonym, along with said evaluation data of said search word and said evaluation data of said extracted synonym, **in a manner in which said search word and said extracted synonym are selectable**" (emphasis added). Thus, the option of using the search word or the extracted synonym is provide to the user.

The Examiner asserts, "the extracted synonyms are include[d] in the search, and they are search terms and thus they are displayed along with their total number of hits and are selectable just as the other search terms are" (page 2, item 3 of the outstanding Office Action). In essence, the Examiner's is asserting that the results of searches indicating search terms and total number of hits in East is same as the claimed "presenting" for conducting a search.

However, East fails to disclose or suggest what is extracted from the specified thesaurus on page 18. Moreover, EAST does not disclose or suggest that the search terms displayed on page 45, such as "THREE", "DIMENSIONAL", "JIGSAW" and "PUZZLE", are extracted from the specified thesaurus. Thus, the Examiner's assertion is not supported by EAST, and amounts to hindsight.

Even assuming that EAST may suggests displaying the extracted synonym, EAST does not teach or suggest "presenting said user with **both of said search word and said extracted synonym**, along with said evaluation data of said search word and said evaluation data of said

extracted synonym, in a manner in which said search word and said extracted synonym are selectable”, as recited in claim 1 (emphasis added).

Instead, page 45 of East explicitly states, “How EAST Processes a search”, and in description of the conducted search indicates that “No \$ was used in this search so intermediate postings were returned for both terms.” This portion of East clearly indicates that the search terms listed on page 45 are based on results of the searches.

The search options discussed on page 18 of East that the Examiner compares to the claimed “extracting a synonym of said search word” does not teach or suggest extracting from “a synonym file”, as taught by the invention. At best, this discussion of East only deals with searches using a term in conjunction with synonym thereof, and does not teach or suggest extracting the synonym for presenting “in a manner in which said search word and said extracted synonym are selectable” to allow the user to define the subject of the search prior to conducting the search (see, for example claim 1).

The invention of claim 1 includes, “data representing a search word selected by said user or data representing a synonym selected by said user” and “presenting said user with data concerning an identified document including the selected search word or the selected synonym.” That is, the document containing the selected word or synonym is retrieved as a result of the search after accepting the user’s selection. Independent claims 8 and 15 recite features similar to claim 1.

Claims 1, 8 and 15 of the present application recite, “presenting said user with both of said search word and said extracted synonym, along with said evaluation data of said search word and said evaluation data of said extracted synonym, in a manner in which said search word and said extracted synonym are selectable.” The Applicants respectfully submit that East does not disclose or suggest at least this feature of each of the independent claims 1, 8 and 15.

Accordingly, East does not disclose every element of the Applicants' claims 1, 8 and 15. In order for a reference to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach each and every element of the claim (MPEP §2131). Therefore, since East does not disclose the features recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15, as stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 8 and 15 patentably distinguishes over East, and withdrawal of the §102(b) rejection is earnestly and respectfully solicited.

Claims depending from claims 1, 8 and 15 include all of the features of that claim plus additional features which are not disclosed by East.

Moreover, dependent claims 3, 10 and 17 also recite patentably distinguishing features of the own, since EAST does not teach or suggest that the extracted synonym “other than said search condition designated by said user”, and “presenting said user with both of said search word and said extracted synonym.”

Dependent claims 5, 12, and 19 recite patentably distinguishing features of the own, since EAST does not teach or suggest “judging whether or not **said evaluation data of said search word and said evaluation data of said extracted synonym** satisfies a predetermined condition” (emphasis added). The examiner indicates that EAST page 18 shows including synonyms, having a predefined condition of being located in the Thesaurus. However, the “predefined condition of being located in the Thesaurus” discussed in EAST does not teach or suggest a predetermined condition of “said evaluation data.”

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 16, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over East in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,692,176 (Holt), and claims 4, 11 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over East, Holt and U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0068396 (Kawatani).

As discussed above, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 patentably distinguishes over East. Further, Holt does not cure the deficiencies of East regarding claims 2, 6, 7, 9, 13, 14, 16, 20 and 21 of the present application.

In particular, Holt provides screen (160 in Fig. 13) only after the user selects the terms of the search description for which equivalent terms are desired, where the user chooses any number and combination of morphological variations and synonyms. Meaning, Holt does not teach or suggest specifying including “extracting said search word from a sentence input as said search condition by a morphological analysis”, as recited in claim 2 (see also, claims 9 and 16).

Further, Holt and East, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest “predetermined condition” including number of documents of “said extracted synonym” (see, claims 6, 13 and 20), and presenting the user with data of documents including appearance of “said selected synonym... in order of values calculated” (see, claims 7, 14 and 21).

Kawatani adds nothing to the teachings of Holt and East. Instead, Kawatani discusses giving a weight to each term based on its frequency of occurrence within an input document to

define importance of each sentence (see, paragraphs 2, 24 and 30). Meaning, Kawatani is limited to determining contribution of each sentence to the central concepts of a document to determine importance of each sentence based on a magnitude of the respective obtained contribution.

The cited references do not teach or suggest obtaining evaluation data of the search word and its synonym in relation to a search by calculating a score based on appearance frequency of the search word and the synonym using "first" and "second" appearance frequency of both the search word and the extracted synonym (see also, claims 4, 11 and 18).

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/07/2007
1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

By: Temnit Afework
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202